

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on October 26, 2010. Applicants have reviewed the Interview Summary mailed November 4, 2010 and agree with its contents. Further, if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions, Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned below.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are pending. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

**Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 is amended by way of this reply to clarify aspects of the invention. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments as support may be found, for example, on p. 18, ll. 3 – p. 19, ll. 11 and Figure 4 of the application as filed.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the

claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference....” MPEP § 2143(A).

Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,507,872 (“Geshwind”) in view of US Pat. No. 6,697,859 (“Takahashi”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed to extracting and transmitting an application that is made up of several interactive pages, each interactive page having a main file and included components. The files that make up the application are organized in a tree structure, with depth levels and links between main files. Included components necessary for forming an interactive page (e.g., applets, images, etc.) are pointed to by inclusion links. Navigation links, which are separate and distinct from inclusion links, are used to reference the main files of other interactive pages that are of different depths. See Specification, pages 6, 8, and 16-17.

In order to organize the files that make up the application, into a tree structure, analysis of semantic and syntactic content of a main file is performed. Amended claim 1 requires, in part, that the semantic and syntactic analysis includes, for each navigation link in the main file, detecting the navigation link and processing the navigation link when information identifying the file is not in a set of previously referenced files. Amended claim 1 further requires, in part, that to process the file, navigation link is stored with a value identifying the order of detection and a value identifying the depth level of the main file. The value indentifying the order of detection is incremented for subsequent navigation links. Further, the information identifying the file is stored in the set of previously referenced files so that the file

processed once regardless of the number of navigation links to the file. *See, e.g.,* Specification, p. 18, ll. 3 – p. 19, ll. 11 and Figure 4.

On page 7 of the Action, the Examiner admits that Geshwind fails to disclose semantic and syntactic analysis. Therefore, it logically follows that Geshwind cannot disclose the steps of the semantic and syntactic analysis recited above. However, the Examiner relies on Takahashi as disclosing the semantic and syntactic analysis. Applicants respectfully assert that for the following reasons Takahashi fails to disclose the semantic and syntactic analysis of the amended claims.

Turning to Takahashi, Takahashi is directed to transferring documents from a server to a client by prioritizing the documents and embedded objects within documents. *See* Takahashi, col. 5, ll. 40-59. The only analysis disclosed in Takahashi is the analysis of “the content of the data to detect the presence of embedded object b and c”. *Id.* There is absolutely no further discussion of analysis in Takahashi. Because Takahashi merely discloses analysis that includes only detecting a presence of embedded objects, the analysis in Takahashi cannot be equated to the semantic and syntactic analysis in the claims that includes (i) for each navigation link in the main file, detecting the navigation link and processing the navigation link when information identifying the file is not in a set of previously referenced files; and (ii) to process the file, the navigation link is stored with a value identifying the order of detection and a value identifying the depth level of the main file as required by amended independent claim 1.

In view of the above, it is clear that the cited art fails to support an obviousness rejection of amended independent claim 1. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geshwind and Takahashi, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,886,178 (“Mao”).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geshwind, Takahashi, and Mao, and further in view of US Publication No. 2002/0107892 (“Chittu”).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geshwind, Takahashi, Mao, and Chittu, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,230,168 (“Unger”).

To the extent that these rejections may still apply to the amended claims, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

As described above, Geshwind and Takahashi fail to disclose or render obvious the limitations of the amended claims. Further, Mao, Chittu, and Unger fail to supply that which Geshwind lacks. Specifically, Mao, Chittu, and Unger are all completely silent with respect to the semantic and syntactic analysis that includes (i) for each navigation link in the main file, detecting the navigation link and processing the navigation link when information identifying the file is not in a set of previously referenced files; and (ii) to process the file, the navigation link is stored with a value identifying the order of detection and a value identifying the depth level of the main file as required by amended claim 1.


In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Geshwind, Mao, Chittu, and Unger, whether taken together or separately. Dependent claims 7-10 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/117001).

Dated: November 5, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By   
for Jonathan P. Osha *50,235*  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants